

C

By John Sergeant

✓

W 5-2591

D 9802

2/4

4/4

1/4

THE
SCHISM
OF THE
Church of England &c.

Demonstrated in Four

ARGUMENTS.

Formerly Propos'd to Dr. Gunning and Dr. Pearson, the late
Bishops of *Ely* and *Chester*, by Two Catholick Dispu-
tants, in a Celebrated Conference upon that Point.



O X O N.

Printed by *Henry Cruttenden*, One of His Majesty's
Printers. MDCLXXXVIII.

2011 341

Journal of the

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

1811

The SCHISM of the Church of England Demonstrated in Four Arguments, &c.

The Definition of Schism.

Schism is a Voluntary Separation of One Part from the Whole, True, Visible, [Hierarchical] CHURCH of CHRIST.

The First Argument.

WHosoever make a voluntary separation of themselves from the whole, true, visible Church of Christ, are Schismatiques ;

But all those of the English Protestant party, make a voluntary separation of themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ :

Therefore all those of the English Protestant party are Schismatiques.

The first Proposition is evident, and granted by our Adversaries when they allowed our Definition to be a *true Proposition*. We prove the second Proposition.

Whosoever voluntarily separate themselves from all particular visible Christian Churches in the world of the same time with them, make a voluntary separation of themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ ;

But all those who are of the English Protestant party, voluntarily separate themselves from all the particular visible Christian Churches in the world of the same time with them :

Therefore all those of the English Protestant party make a voluntary separation from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

The first Proposition is manifest : For in the extent of all the true visible Christian Churches in the world, must

be contained the whole true visible Church of Christ. The second Proposition we prove:

Whosoever voluntarily separate themselves from the present Eastern and Western Churches, and all Churches in their Communion, voluntarily separate themselves from all the particular Christian visible Churches in the world, of the same time with them;

But all those of the English Protestant Party voluntarily separate themselves from the present Eastern and Western Churches, and all Churches in their Communion:

Therefore all those of the English Protestant party voluntarily separate themselves from all the particular visible Christian Churches in the world, of the same time with them.

The first Proposition is certainly true. For no Assembly or Congregation of Christians can be named (which is not manifestly Heretical) that is not contained in this Proposition. We prove the second by enumeration:

If they do not so separate themselves, let that Church be nominated amongst the forementioned, from which they do not voluntarily separate themselves. It is not (confessedly) the Roman; for they all profess themselves not to be of her Communion: Nor the Greek, under obedience to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; for they have as little dependance, or agreement with that, either in Doctrine, Subjection, Discipline, Rites, or Communion, as they have with the Roman; our Adversaries producing but four Points wherein they seemed to agree with Protestants against us; and those either not of Faith, or clearly mistaken, or not as they are controverted betwixt us. And the same reason proceeds of all Churches in actual Communion with them. *Ergo*, The second Proposition is true.

It will avail nothing to alledge here, that English Protestants communicate with many other Reformed Churches beyond Sea; for all those are comprehended under our terms the *English Protestant Party*; and it is as evident, that each of those

those voluntarily separate themselves from all other Churches, as it is that these of *England* separate.

Neither will it excuse them to say, that they only refined that Church, which they found corrupted and defiled; which notwithstanding remains still amongst them the very same in substance that it was before. For it is evident, that all of them, whether English or others, separated themselves from all those National Churches and the Pastors of them, who were in quiet possession of Church-government immediately before they began; rejected in all Countries respectively, where they entered, their Authority, dispossessing them of their Sees and Cures, intruding themselves into their places, and gathering tumultuously among themselves particular Congregations and Conventicles, instituting new and unheard of Rites and Ceremonies, without dependance of any, who were in possession of Church-government immediately before them through the whole world: and all this as notoriously, and undeniably, as any Schismatiques ever did before their time: In all which particulars we appeal to the Historians on both parts, who have writ the Records of these two last Ages.

The Second Argument.

Whosoever adhere to Schismatical Pastors (as *Schismatical* is understood in our Definition) are Schismatiques.

But all English Protestants adhere to Schismatical Pastors, as *Schismatical* is understood in our Definition:

Therefore all English Protestants are Schismatiques.

The first proposition is evident. For those being only such as separate themselves from the whole true visible Church of Christ, all who adhere to them, must also separate with them, and thereby become Schismatiques. The second proposition we prove.

Whosoever adhere to those, who are successively Ordained by such Schismatical Pastors, maintaining the same cause which

which they began, adhere to Schismatical Pastors, as *Schismatical* is understood in our Definition;

But all English Protestants adhere to those, who were successively Ordained by such *Schismatical* Pastors, maintaining the same cause which they began:

Therefore all English Protestants adhere to Schismatical Pastours, as *schismatical*, is understood in our Definition.

The first Proposition needs no proof, as being clear *ex terminis*: The second, *viz.* that those, whom we say were so Ordained, maintain the same cause, which was begun by those who Ordained them, is also clear: it remains therefore only to prove, that they were Ordained successively by Schismatiques, understood in the sense of our Definition: which we thus prove:

Whosoever adhere to those, who were successively Ordained by *Matthew Parker*, and the other first Protestant Bishops of his time, adhere to those, who were successively Ordained by such Schismatical Pastors;

But all English Protestants adhere to such, as were successively Ordained by *Matthew Parker*, and the first Protestant Bishops of his time:

Therefore all English Protestants adhere to those, who were successively Ordained by such schismatical Pastors.

The second Proposition is clear, and confessed by all: We thus prove the first:

If *Matthew Parker*, and the rest were such schismatical Pastors, then whosoever adhere to those, who were Ordained by them, adhere to those who were Ordained successively by such Schismatical Pastors;

But *Matthew Parker*, and the rest were such Schismatical Pastors:

Therefore all those, who adhere to those, who were successively Ordained by them, adhere to those who were Ordained by such Schismatical Pastors.

The first proposition is clear: we prove the second.

Whosoever either Possess the Sees and Offices of lawful Bi-

Bishops, those lawful Bishops yet living, or unite themselves to such as possess them, are such schismatical Pastors;

But *Matthew Parker*, and other first Protestant Bishops of his time, either possess the Sees and Offices of lawful Bishops, those lawful Bishops yet living, or united themselves to such as possess them:

Therefore *Matthew Parker*, and all the first Protestant Bishops of his time, were such schismatical Pastors.

The first proposition is evident of it self. The first part of the second proposition, That the Sees, &c. of living Bishops were possess'd, and that others of these new Bishops united themselves to such as possess'd them, is also clear, as matter of fact, out of *Stow*, *Speed*, *Cambden*, *Mason*, *Goodwin*, *Fern*, &c. The second part, viz. that those living Bishops were lawful Bishops, even when they were deprived, we prove thus:

Whosoever were once lawful Bishops, and never did any thing after, whereby they became unlawful, remained still lawful Bishops;

But those deprived Bishops were once lawful Bishops, and never did any thing after, whereby they became unlawful:

Therefore those Bishops remained still lawful Bishops.

The first proposition is evident. The first part of the second proposition, viz. that they were once lawful Bishops, we prove thus:

No National Church can be a true particular Church of Christ, unless those who have the place of Bishops in it be lawful Bishops;

But the National Church of *England* in *Queen Maries* time was a true particular Church of Christ:

Therefore those, who had the place of Bishops in it, were lawful Bishops. Now I subsume. But those, who had then the place of Bishops in that National Church, were those deprived Bishops: *Ergo*.

The first proposition is clear. For no true Church can unite it self to unlawful Pastors. The second Proposition is also clear.

clear from the confession of our Adversaries, who grant, That the Church of *Rome*, and all those of her Communion are true Churches of Christ. See *Bramhall* and *Fern* upon this Subject.

We prove now the second part of the second Proposition, That those Bishops did nothing, whereby they became unlawful Bishops.

If those lawful Bishops did any thing, whereby they became unlawful Bishops, it must be supposed to be that for which they were deprived;

But that for which they were deprived, did not make them unlawful Bishops:

Therefore they did nothing, whereby they became unlawful Bishops.

The first proposition seems evident. For no prudent man can suppose, that they would deprive them for that which made them not unlawful Bishops, if they had been convinced to have done any other thing which might make them unlawful Bishops. The second we prove:

All the reasons, for which they were deprived, was resisting the pretended Reformation, and refusing the Oath of Supremacy;

But those could not make them unlawful Bishops: Therefore the causes, for which they were deprived, could not make them unlawful Bishops.

The first proposition being matter of fact, is witnessed by *Cambden*, *Goodwin*, and others. The second proposition we prove thus:

No proceeding in practice, according to the common Tenets, the holding whereof made them not unlawful Bishops, can make them unlawful Bishops;

But resisting the pretended Reformation, and refusing the Oath of Supremacy, was only a proceeding according to the common Tenets, the holding whereof made them not unlawful Bishops:

There-

Therefore resisting that Reformation, and refusing that Oath could not make them unlawful Bishops.

The first proposition is clear in it self: For no man can be thought to become an unlawful Bishop, *v. g.* by praying for the souls in Purgatory, if the holding that such prayers are lawful, make him not an unlawful Bishop; and so of the rest.

The second proposition is also evident. For whilst they were lawful Bishops in Queen *Maries* time, they held it a common necessary point of Religion to resist that Reformation, and refuse that Oath of Supremacy.

If it should be replied, that as the Queen had power to deprive lawful temporal Officers at her pleasure, so might she also deprive at her pleasure lawful Ecclesiastical Officers and Bishops, as being no less chief Governour of the Church then of the Commonwealth; we answer, even that admitted (not granted) yet this second she could not do: For the Kings and Queens of *England* pretended only to succeed into those prerogatives of Church-government, which the Pope had before them, as is clear in King *Henry* the 8th. But the Pope himself had no power to dispossess a lawful Bishop remaining a lawful Bishop at his pleasure. Therefore neither had the Queen any such power.

The Third Argument.

We prove in this Argument, by another *medium*, that *Matthew Parker* and his Associates, and consequently all who adhered to them, or adhere to their Successors were and are Schismatiques, separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

Matthew Parker was a Schismatique, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ:

Therefore all those, who were willingly consecrated by him, and all their Successors and Adherents, were such Schismatiques.

The Consequence is clear, as appears in the former Argument : The Antecedent we prove.

Whosoever was willingly consecrated by Schismaticques, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ, is himself a Schismaticque, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ ;

But *Matthew Parker* was willingly consecrated by Schismaticques, voluntarily separate from the whole true visible Church of Christ :

Therefore *Matthew Parker* was a Schismaticque, voluntarily separated from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

The first proposition is already proved. For to be willingly consecrated by such Schismaticques is schismatical, and therefore separating from the whole true visible Church of Christ.

The second proposition we prove, as matter of fact. *Goodwin* in the different lives of *Barlow*, *Coverdale*, *Scory*, and *Hodgkins*, who were the Consecrators of *Parker*, acknowledges, that the three first were possessors of the Sees and Offices of other Catholick Bishops living. *Barlow* was intruded into the place of *Christopherson*, Bishop of *Chichester*, Dec. 20. 1559, and elect to it, before he consecrated *Parker*, as appears by the Queens Letters, *Gulielmo Barlow, nunc Cicestriensi electo*. *Scory* was put by King *Edward* the 6th into *Day's* place, then being Bishop of *Chichester*. *Coverdale* into *Vecey's* place, by King *Edward* the 6th, Aug. 30. 1551, which *B. Vecey* was forced to resign, as appears by his being willing to be restor'd (as he was afterwards) by Queen *Mary*. *Hodgkins* was only a Suffragan ; but communicated with these three in this consecration ; and thereby became Schismaticque.

The Fourth Argument.

Whosoever subject themselves unto these, as to their lawful Pastors, who have no true jurisdiction over them, are Schif

Schismatiques; But English Protestants, ever since Qu. *Elizabeth's* time, have subjected themselves to those, as to their lawful Pastors, who have no true jurisdiction over them: Therefore English Protestants, ever since Qu. *Elizabeth's* time, are Schismatiques.

The first proposition is clear, from 1 *Tim.* 4. 3. where describing Heretiques, &c. *S. Paul* says, *Ad sua desideria conservabant sibi Magistros, &c.* according to their own fancies they shall heap up Teachers, or Masters, that is, confusedly and tumultuously, without power or authority. And from *Ro.* 10. 15. *Quomodo predicabunt, nisi mittantur?* How shall they preach, unless they be sent? For their adhering to such, supposes the rejection of all those who are legally authorized to govern them, which is formal Schism.

The second proposition we prove by Enumeration.

They could not have true Jurisdiction over the particular Bishopricks and Cures of *England*; neither by the force of Orders which they receiv'd, (if they had any such) for one may have true Order without any true Jurisdiction, as appears in the Act of *K. Henry 8th*, concerning Suffragans, who had true Episcopal Order, and yet had not Episcopal Jurisdiction, as the Act expressly says; and many are made Ministers in the Universities, before they have any Jurisdiction over any particular Parishes. Neither could they have it from those who consecrated them; for never a one of them had any themselves, as being either Suffragans, or not design'd to any See, or elected, and not invested. Neither was there then any Primate in *England* to give it them. Neither had they it by general consent of the Bishops of *England*; for they all resisted. Neither would they have it from the Pope, or Patriarch of *Constantinople*; nor would either of them give it them: Much less had they either from a General Council; for that was against them: Nor from the general Consent of Catholick Bishops, either of the Eastern or Western Church; for all oppos'd them. Neither did their fellow-Superintendents beyond Sea, or could they confer Jurisdiction

on upon them; for they were all as void of Jurisdiction as these themselves were. Neither could they have it from the Queen or Parliament; for that had been an *heaping up of Teachers to themselves*, 2 Tim. 4. 3. now cited. And Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction being a Spiritual Government, is declared 1 Cor. 12. 18. to be a *supernatural gift*, and Institution of God in his Church; and ver. 6. *Propheying*, that is, the Power of Preaching, is declared to be a *Gift of the Holy Ghost*; and therefore are above the politick power of Magistrates of any Commonwealth. And Act. 20. 28. the Holy Ghost is said to appoint Bishops to govern the Church of God; and so the giving Jurisdiction to them must be supernatural, coming from the Holy Ghost, and above the reach of politick Governors. And if Kings, Queens, or Parliaments, who are under the number of Scholars and Subjects in matters of Religion, could communicate Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction to their Prelates, they would be Governors of their Governors, and Masters of their Masters, which is quite contrary to Mat. 10. 24. *Non est Discipulus supra Magistrum*, The Disciple is not above his Master, i. e. in those things wherein he is his Master, which is here in Church government. As therefore our Saviour Joh. 20. and Mat. 28. sent his Apostles with power of Governing and Preaching, and the Apostles gave that Spiritual Jurisdiction to others, whom they sent to divers particular Provinces, and those Ecclesiastical Persons only amongst all Orthodox Christians still communicated the like Jurisdiction to others, both in the primitive and after ages; and never did any Catholic Prince, or State, pretend to confer Jurisdiction upon their own Bishops, or Pastors: It is most manifest, that neither *Queen Elizabeth*, nor her Parliament, had any such power. And consequently it follows from this Enumeration of parts that those *Elizabethan* Bishops and Pastors had no Jurisdiction at all, or any of their Successors; and therefore, That all English Protestants, attributing such Jurisdiction to them, and adhering to them as their lawful Bishops and Pastors are Formal Schismatiques.

F I N I S.